



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/801,500	08/23/2004	Keith Antonio Dixon	1410/77137	1831
48940	7590	06/23/2008	EXAMINER	
FITCH EVEN TABIN & FLANNERY			MCKINLEY, CHRISTOPHER BRIAN	
120 S. LASALLE STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 1600			3781	
CHICAGO, IL 60603-3406				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/23/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/801,500	Applicant(s) DIXON ET AL.
	Examiner CHRISTOPHER B. MCKINLEY	Art Unit 3781

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 August 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 23 August 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-16/16B)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/16/2004
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the first end" in line 8. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 12 recites the limitation "the first end" in line 6. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-4, 8-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Offerman et al. (2004/0217116) in view of Waber et al. (2,754,030). Offerman et al. disclose the limitations of the claims including a package assembly (figs. 1-11) comprising a tray (30), cover (fig. 11), movable to a partially open position thereby creating a dispensing slot (fig. 3), stop member (46a), slide rails (45), metal (Abstract).

Offerman et al. exclude what Waber et al. teach, a tray for accommodating and dispensing food items having a pair of opposed ends (20 & 40), shelf/intermediate wall (18) and ramp (19) thereby facilitating metering. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Offerman et al. with the aforementioned structural features of Waber et al. in order to facilitate metered dispensing.

5. Claims 5 and 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as described in par. 4 in view of Duell (2,378,003). The references as described in par. 4 disclose the limitations of the claims substantially excluding what Duell teaches, a recessed shelf (fig. 2, 21) in order to selectively receive tablets. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the references as described in par. 4 with a recessed shelf on an intermediate wall, as taught by Duell '003, in order to selectively receive container contents.

6. Claims 6, 7 and 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as described in par. 5 in view of Storz (2003/0106900). The references as described in par. 5 disclose the limitations of the claims substantially excluding what Storz teaches, a depression (fig. 7, 16) to control movement of container contents. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of

Art Unit: 3781

ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the references as described in par. 5 with , a depression to control movement of container contents, as taught by Storz.

Conclusion

7. Applicant is duly reminded that a complete response must satisfy the requirements of 37 C.F.R. 1.111, including: "The reply must present arguments pointing out the specific distinctions believed to render the claims, including any newly presented claims, patentable over any applied references. A general allegation that the claims "define a patentable invention" without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references does not comply with the requirements of this section. Moreover, "The prompt development of a clear issue requires that the replies of the applicant meet the objections to and rejections of the claims." Applicant should also specifically point out the support for any amendments made to the disclosure. See MPEP 2163.06 and MPEP 714.02. The "disclosure" includes the claims, the specification and the drawings.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHRISTOPHER B. MCKINLEY whose telephone number is (571)272-3370. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7:00 AM - 5:30 PM.

9. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anthony Stashick can be reached on (571) 272-4561. The fax phone

Art Unit: 3781

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

10. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/C. B. M./
Examiner, Art Unit 3781

/Anthony D Stashick/
Anthony D Stashick
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3781